

### REMARKS

At the outset, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated January 12, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 5, 11, and 16 are hereby amended. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 7-9 and 18-20.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 11, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Hirakata (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,172). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As set forth at M.P.E.P. § 2131, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Applicant respectfully submits that Hirakata fails to teach, either expressly or inherently, at least each and every element presently recited in (i.e., anticipate) claims 1, 5, 11, and 16. For example, Hirakata fails to anticipate “allowing adjacent pixels in a gate line direction within the at least one pixel block to respond to data signals having the same polarity; and allowing pixels outside the at least one pixel block to respond to data signals having a polarity contrary to pixels adjacently arranged at left and right sides thereof,” as recited in claim 1; “first signal supplying means for setting at least one pixel block each of which includes at least two data lines within the liquid crystal panel to apply data signals having the same polarity to adjacent pixels in a gate line direction within the at least one pixel block; and second signal supplying means for applying data signals to pixels outside the at least one pixel block, wherein the applied data signals have a polarity contrary to data signals applied to pixels adjacently arranged at left and right sides thereof and also arranged outside the at least one pixel block,” as recited in claim 5; “applying video signals to at least one second plurality of consecutively arranged data lines such that video signals having opposite polarities are applied to pixels adjacent each other along a gate line direction, wherein data lines within the at least one second

plurality of consecutively arranged data lines are not included within the at least one first plurality of consecutively arranged data lines,” as recited in claim 11; and “second signal supplying means for applying video signals to at least one second plurality of consecutively arranged data lines such that video signals having opposite polarities are applied to pixels adjacent each other along a gate line direction, wherein data lines within the at least one second plurality of consecutively arranged data lines are not included within the at least one first plurality of consecutively arranged data lines,” as recited in claim 16. For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the present rejection of claims 1, 5, 11, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claims 2-4 and 15 variously depend from claims 1 and 11 and, therefore, include all of the elements recited in claims 1 and 11. As established above, Hirakata does not anticipate claims 1 and 11. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Hirakata does not anticipate claims 2-4 and 15. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the present rejection of claims 2-4 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Moreover, and with respect to the rejections of claims 2 and 3, Applicant respectfully submits that Hirakata fails to teach what it is asserted as teaching. For example, the Examiner asserts that column 16, lines 54-59 and Figure 17A of Hirakata teaches “driving a liquid crystal panel wherein the pixel block is positioned at a boundary portion between column drivers” and that column 16, lines 45-53 and Figure 17A of Hirakata teaches “driving a liquid crystal panel wherein the pixel block includes at least two data lines to which a data is applied from the same column driver.” Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the disclosure at column 16, lines 45-59 of Hirakata consists of claim 1 while Figure 17A illustrates a conventional polarity pattern. Moreover, when taken alone, neither claim 1 nor Figure 17A of Hirakata teach the elements recited in Applicant’s claims 2 and 3. In view of the additional arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully submits Hirakata fails to anticipate the elements recited in Applicant’s claims 2 and 3 as asserted by the Examiner and, therefore, requests withdrawal of the present rejection of claims 2 and 3.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hirakata in view of Okumura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,739,804). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 6 and 17 depend from claims 5 and 16, respectively and, therefore, include all of the elements recited in claims 5 and 16. As established above, Hirakata does not anticipate claims 5 and 15. Moreover, Okumura et al. does not cure the deficiency of Hirakata with respect to claims 5 and 16. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Hirakata in view of Okumura et al. fails to render claims 6 and 17 *prima facie* obvious. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the present rejection of claims 6 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Moreover, in rejecting claims 6 and 17, the Examiner asserts that Okumura et al. teaches “a liquid crystal panel comprising line-inversion control means ...; and dot-inversion control means ... (col. 1, lines 53-62).” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Specifically, at column 1, lines 53-62, Okumura et al. teaches:

... the method disclosed in Jpn. Pat. Appln. KOKAI Publication No. 3-51887 ... has been proposed in which the power supply is held constant and a switch is provided in a driving IC to perform switching between signal lines for each field. Unfortunately, even by the use of this method the consumption power increases in realizing the dot inversion driving by which a high image quality is achieved by the combination of signal line inversion and line inversion, since it is necessary to invert the polarity for each line.

In view of the actual teachings of Okumura et al. as cited above, Applicant respectfully submit that Okumura et al. fails to teach what it is currently relied upon as teaching. For at least this additional reason, Applicant request withdrawal of the present rejection of claims 6 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 10 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hirakata in view of Jeong et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,271,816). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 10 and 12-14, variously depend from claims 1 and 11 and, therefore, include all of the elements recited in claims 1 and 11. As established above, Hirakata does not anticipate claims 1 and 11. Moreover, Jeong et al. does not cure the deficiency of Hirakata with respect to claims 1 and 11. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Hirakata in view of Jeong et al. fails to render claims 10 and 12-14 *prima facie* obvious. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the present rejection of claims 10 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: July 11, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Eric J. Nuss

Registration No.: 40,106  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant